Date(s) of Assessment:	Project:
Assessor(s):	Review Examined:

		Y, N,	F, O	Comments
		NA		<del>-</del>
REVI	IEW PREPARATION			
1	Have standards been identified to clearly define the review process?			
2	Were guidelines used to prepare for the review?			
3	Has the project submitted any request for deviations or waivers to the defined process?			
4	Have entrance and exit criteria been established for the review?			
5	Was an agenda prepared and distributed in advance of the review?			
6	Was the review package provided with ample time to review?			
7	Were the appropriate stakeholders in attendance?			
REVI	EW CONTENT			
8	Were the goals of the review and any review prerequisites provided?			
9	Was the review process addressed, including the method for capturing Requests for Action (RFAs), risks, or issues?			
10	Was an overview of the software project/system provided (e.g., mission goals, key functionality, operational characteristics)?			
11	Was IV & V status provided?			
12	Was status given on action items from the Test Readiness Review?			
REQ	UIREMENTS			
13	Was the Software Requirements Traceability Matrix (SRTM) verified for accuracy (i.e., updated to include the latest revision of requirements)?			

Revision: 2.0 Page 1 of 4

		Y, N, NA	F, O	Comments
14	Is the SRTM included in the presentation material?			
TEST	TING			
15	Has safety-critical software been verified?			
16	Did testing and test results cover all functional, performance, and acceptance test activities?			
17	Are the acceptance and/or failure criteria included in the test report documentation?			
18	Is a summary status of all problem reports presented (open and closed)?			
19	Was system testing performance results presented?			
20	Were regression test results presented?			
21	Has the test team provided a recommendation for software acceptance?			
22	Are safety issues concerning the testing activities presented?			
23	Have all workarounds and non- functioning software components been identified and documented?			
CON	FIGURATION MANAGEMENT			
24	Is there evidence that Configuration Management (CM) processes (i.e., software change control and tracking procedures) were implemented as specified in the CM Plan?			
SOFT	TWARE QUALITY			
25	Is a summary of software quality (SQ) activities presented?			
26	Is there evidence that software quality procedures were implemented as specified in the SQ Plan?			
RISKS, ISSUES, and RFAs				
27	Are technical risks, mitigation plans, and issues documented with plans for tracking and closure?			

Revision: 2.0 Page 2 of 4

		Y, N,	F, O	Comments
		NA		
SOFT	WARE DOCUMENTATION STATUS			
28	Does the review package include the			
	following approved documents:			
28a	Software Requirements Document			
	(final)			
28b	Software Interface Requirements			
	Document (final)			
28c	Software Design Document (final)			
28d	Software Test Plan (final)			
28e	Software Test Procedures (final)			
28f	Software Test Report (final)			
28g	Software Version Description			
	Document			
28h	Software Users Manual (final)			
28i	Software Maintenance Plan			
POST	REVIEW ACTIVITIES			
29	At the conclusion of the review is an			
	understanding reached on the validity			
	and degree of completeness of the			
	Acceptance Review?			
30	Did all designated parties concur in			
	the acceptability of the Acceptance			
	Review?			
31	Are there any risks, issues, or request			
	for actions (RFAs) that require follow-			
	up?			
32	Is there a process in place for			
	reviewing and tracking the closure of			
	risks, issues, or RFAs?			
33	Have all artifacts been placed under			
	formal configuration control (e.g.,			
	review packages)?			
34	Were Lessons Learned addressed and			
captured?				
	REFERENCE ITEMS/DOCUMENTS			
IEEE Canadan I for Cofement Deviant IEEE CTD 1020 1007				
IEEE Standard for Software Reviews, IEEE STD 1028-1997				

Revision: 2.0 Page 3 of 4

Date(s) of Assessment:		Project:				
Assessor(s):		Review Examined:				
COM	COMMENTS PAGE of					
#	<b>Comments from assessment</b>					

Revision: 2.0 Page 4 of 4